



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ON THE  
SCANDINAVIAN AFFINITIES  
OF THE  
ANCIENT ETRUSCAN LANGUAGE,

By THE REV. J. W. DONALDSON, D.D.

Read 11th January 1854.

---

My reasons for wishing to lay before the Ethnological Society an exposition of my theory respecting the origin and language of the ancient Etruscans are probably known to most members of this body. On the 16th of March 1853 Dr. Freund communicated to you a Paper, entitled, "A Report on Dr. Donaldson's Solution of the Etruscan Problem," in which, according to the abridged, but, I believe, official account in the *Literary Gazette* of April 9th, my ethnological reasoning is declared to be "philologically unsound," and all my conclusions are rejected with some emphasis and very little ceremony. Under these circumstances, it was not unnatural that I should regret my inability to be present on the occasion, in accordance with the very courteous invitation of my learned friend, the Honorary Secretary, or that I should accept the offer, subsequently made to me, of attending some meeting of this Society, for the purpose of vindicating my own views, and, at the same time, the philology of my country, from the attempt which Dr. Freund has made to disparage both the one and the other.

In the first place, I must remark that there appears to me to be something invidious in the comparison which Dr. Freund makes between the first and second editions of the *Varronianus*. I did not publish that book for the purpose of ventilating any theory respecting the Etruscans. My object was, to collect and survey all the materials for a scientific investigation of Latin grammar and lexicography. With a view to

the proper execution of the task which I proposed to myself, it was necessary that I should examine all the remains of the old languages of Italy, the Etruscan among others; and that I should state the case fairly respecting the current theories about each of them. Of all the essays on the subject of the ancient Etruscans, that which had recently been put forth by Lepsius appeared to me to be most sound and satisfactory; and I am still of opinion that it is true as far it goes. But it would be a strange check on the faculty of independent investigations if my acceptance of another man's theory, when I had nothing better to offer, were to prevent me from making a further discovery of the truth for myself. On the contrary, I hope to learn as long as I live; and, in accordance with the old saying, γηράσκειν ἀεὶ πολλὰ διδασκόμενος. Consequently, if Dr. Freund can discover a theory respecting the ancient Etruscans which is truer or more complete than mine, I will promise to relinquish my own views, and to adopt his with cheerfulness and gratitude. But I confess that I do not look forward with much confidence to such a result.

Then, again, Dr. Freund must excuse me for reminding him that he has not made a fair or scholarlike statement respecting the orthography of *Hetruscus* and *Hetruria*. He says "there were no such forms in existence which confirm the statement of old Manutius (in orthographia s. v. *Etruria*): *omnem aspirationem omittunt veteres libri, lapides, et nummi*." This remark would have been available if I had ever stated that the aspirated forms rested on the authority of MSS., inscriptions, or coins. I always cite the words *Etruscus* and *Etruria* without the aspirate, for this is the modern, or authorised and fashionable, orthography; and it is only when speaking of the etymology that I say, "*Et-rusci* or *Het-rusci*." I was writing for scholars, and Dr. Freund, who has compiled a Latin dictionary, ought to have known, what is known to all scholars, that there is no positive certainty about the initial breathings of many words which appear in the Latin writers; and that, in the case of foreign names especially, the presumption is in favour rather of the rough breathing than of the *lenis* in the *Anlaut* or initial syllable: in fact, the universal tendency is rather to omit than to

introduce gratuitously the mark of initial breathing. To say nothing of such co-ordinate forms as *Alcedo* and *Halcedo*, *Alcyon* and *Halcyon*, *arena* and *harena*, *aruspex* and *haruspex*, *arundo* and *harundo*, *arviga* and *harviga*, *edera* and *hedera*, *Ædin* and *Hedin*, &c., does any scholar doubt that *aveo*, also written *habeo*, “I wish,” is the same word as *habeo*, “I have;” or, after Grimm’s discussion on the subject, that both are connected with the Greek *χέειν* and the German *geben*? And yet you will find no stones or coins with an initial *h* in the former word. Does any scholar doubt that *apala ova* are the Greek *ἀπαλὰ ὠά*, “soft eggs;” or that *apalare*, “an egg-spoon,” comes from the same source? And yet there is no authority for an initial aspirate in the Latin transcript. Above all, does any scholar doubt that *Annibal* or *Hannibal* is a representative of the Phœnician *חניבעל*, which begins with *ח*, the strongest of the Semitic aspirates? And yet the Greek *Ἀννίβας* is invariably written with a lenis, and Dausquius and Manutius are at issue with respect to the spelling of the Latin. From all this it appears that I was fully entitled to say *Etrusci* or *Hetrusci*, and that the appearance of the aspirate is at least as probable as its omission. If there are other reasons for identifying the first syllable of *Hetrucus* with the old form *hetra*, and I maintain that these reasons are numerous and weighty, the Roman habit of spelling the word without an aspirate will create no difficulty in the mind of any well-instructed philologist.

Again, it is not true that “the causative verb *lata* of the Perugian inscription, compared with the Icelandic causative verb *at lata*, was what encouraged ‘me’ to announce to the British Association the solution of the Etruscan problem.” I have expressly said (Varron. p. 177), “Every reader . . . *lata*. On reading the first line of the longest Etruscan inscription that of Perugia—we seem to stumble upon this identical phraseology, &c.,” but I add, “Of course there is no *prima-facie* reason to conclude that *tanna* is a verb.” What really settles that point is the inscription on the patera, which, with the permission of the Bury St. Edmund’s Museum Committee, I shall exhibit to you to-night, and which was really the turning-point in the grammatical part of my discovery.

Lastly, Dr. Freund has no right to say, "If Dr. Donaldson had consulted the facsimile of the Perugian inscription, as published by Vermiglioli in 1827, instead of referring to new citations of that facsimile, he would not have made *his* discovery, but would have found that the existence of the word *lat* in the first line of the inscription is not exempt from doubt." I had stated, "The following is an accurate transcript of the facsimiles given by Micali and Vermiglioli" (p. 181); but I had hinted, in the following pages, that I had adopted what I considered "the most probable division of the words."\*

Now in all these points, and they are the only points on which Dr. Freund's strictures have been communicated to the public or to me, I think Dr. Freund has shewn himself more given to cavils than to honest criticism; and I must confess, that any mortification, with which I might have learned that I had not made a convert of him, is much alleviated by the discovery that he is deficient either in candour or accuracy. All fair discussion tends to elicit the truth; but when an eager advocate assumes the functions of a judge, the progress of science is rather impeded than promoted by his efforts.

In general, I feel myself obliged, by the incident which has brought me here to-night, to record my protest against an error which is spreading among us, to the great discredit of British scholarship—the error of supposing that we occupy a position inferior to that of the Germans in many departments of philological learning. It is true that the professed students of philology are more numerous in Germany; but men of genius, who are rare in all countries, are as often found to give their attention to these subjects in England as in any other country. In every department of literature we must echo the old complaint—*πολλοὶ μὲν ναρθηκοφόροι παῦροι δὲ το Βάκχοι* "there are many bearers of the thyrsus, but few really influenced by Bacchic inspiration." This rule, however, applies rather to Germany than to England, as far as the publication of learned works is concerned. We have fewer writers on philology, but then we have fewer quacks. And I must express my sincere regret that an ignorance of what England has done, and

---

\* *Vide* p. 81.—EDITOR

is capable of doing, should lead the syndics of the Oxford press to confide so many works to the editorship of Dindorf, when that University, to my certain knowledge, possesses many better scholars, to say nothing of Cambridge, which, as a Cambridge man, I naturally estimate even more highly.

It is a fact, which, being as well acquainted with German literature as any person in this country, I am able to assert with confidence that Comparative Philology is at this moment flourishing more in England than on the Continent. And when I remark that Young made the first beginnings of a real discovery in Egyptian hieroglyphics, and that Rawlinson deciphered the Behistun inscriptions, which, in spite of Grotefend's hints, the Germans had never attacked with any prospect of success, I venture to prophecy, that if, contrary to my own belief, I have not pointed out the way to a full and final solution of the Etruscan problem, the discovery will be made, sooner or later, by one of my own countrymen.

I shall now take leave of all antagonistic criticism, and state to you, as briefly and plainly as I can, the positive evidence on which my theory rests. It will be found, I think, that there is no description of proof, applicable to a question of ethnography, which is wanting to my demonstration.

Putting aside those physiological traces of ethnical affinity, which are necessarily imperfect in a comparison of ancient races, though no one can mistake the traditional resemblance between the robust, obese, and voracious Etruscans, and the German tribes with which I do not hesitate to connect them,—putting aside these vestiges of personal similarity, it may be stated that there are at most five arguments by which the origin of a defunct branch of the human family may be traced with scientific certainty.

1. The accounts handed down to us by ancient writers.
2. The names, whether national or geographical, which can be traced back by an unbroken and uncontradicted tradition.
3. The ancient names of the race itself, and of its early mythological personages.
4. The religion and distinctive habits of the race.
5. The remains of the language, especially when they have

been transmitted with any clue to the interpretation of particular words or grammatical forms.

Now these are all the grounds on which any one could undertake to establish the ethnographical affinities of an ancient race, and on every one of these grounds I claim your assent to the proposition, that the Rasenic element in the old Etruscans belonged to the same branch of the Teutonic family as the Scandinavian Norsemen who colonized Iceland, and there, in the midst of an uninviting climate, preserved at once their freedom, their old language, and the traditions of their oriental mythology.

1. There is no statement in ancient history more simple or more likely, *à priori*, than the concurrent testimony of Livy (v. 33), Pliny (H. N. v. 20—133), and Justin (xx. 5), that the Ræti and Etruscans belonged to the same stock. Strabo implies an adhesion to the same tradition, when, speaking of certain branches of the population of the Rætian Alps, he says (iv. 6), *Ληπόντιοι καὶ Τριδέντινοι καὶ Στόνοι καὶ ἄλλα πλοῖω μικρά ἔθνη κατέχοντα τὴν Ἰταλίαν ἐν τοῖς πρόσθεν χρόνοις*. Stephanus of Byzantium also briefly defines the Ræti as a *Tyrrhenian*, that is, in his sense, as an *Etruscan* race. And all this tradition is confirmed by relics of art, names of places, and peculiarities of language, still found in the Tyrol. The ancient writers, who were more familiar with the Etruscan than with these northern tribes, naturally regarded the latter as derived from the former. It is a very common practice among these early geographers to invert the direction of emigration, and to mistake the outlet for the source of the stream. But as the peculiar civilization of the Etruscans was due to the Pelasgian elements in their composition, which is obviously of eastern, and ultimately of Phœnician origin, it is more reasonable to conclude that the Rasenic element proceeded from the rude and warlike tribes of the north, than that the civilized inhabitants of the plains of Italy formed settlements in the Alps. And what is there to oppose to this ancient tradition, which found an advocate in Freset in the last century (*Head* and *Inscr.* t. xvii.), and which Niebuhr supports by the sanction of his great name? Its latest opponent is a

Mr. Koch, who has recently published a tract, entitled “Die Alpen Etrusker” (Leipzig, 1853). I have looked through this tract, and find that the author, who is otherwise unknown to me, is unable to unravel the old mythology of the Lydian migration, except by a literal rendering, which, in these days, is puerile; and that, like Zeuss, he confuses between the Rætians, as they were in later times (when the Gauls, who conquered the plains of Lombardy, had penetrated even into their mountain fastnesses), and the aboriginal inhabitants of Rætia, from whence alone the Rasenic conquest of Etruria can have proceeded. That the Rætians of the empire were strongly infused with a Celtic admixture is quite clear; but it is just as certain that a Teutonic element equally strong, and at least as ancient, is found in the language and in the names of mountains and rivers: and while we can easily trace the former to Gallic conquests registered in history, the latter must be reserved for the oldest inhabitants of the district. But whoever the Rætians were, there is positive tradition that they and the Etruscans were cognate tribes; and if so, there must have been a continuous area of population from Etruria to the Tyrol, until the Gauls, as we know, broke through it, and endeavoured, with more or less success, to extend their conquests both to the north and to the south of the valley of the Po.

2. That the Rætians, and therefore the Rasenic ingredients in the ancient population of Etruria were Low-German may be proved by the following geographical argument. Wherever the Low Germans wished to indicate their own boundary line, or the *end* or *wend*-point of their distinctive territory, they applied the term *Wend*, *Wined*, *Winida*, or *Veonoda* to their neighbours over the border. As these neighbours were generally Slavonians, this name was applied to them, as a designation co-extensive with that of *Serb* or *Sorb*, or *Servian* or *Salow-jane*, which they applied to themselves. But we are more certain that the tribes which gave the name of *Wend* to the contiguous population was itself of Teutonic origin, than that the nation which received this name was Slavonian; and therefore we may safely infer that the occurrence of this name marks the boundary line of some branch of the Gothic race.



Thus the Goths of the north designated their eastern neighbours, whether Slavonian or Turanian, by the name of *Wend* or *Finn*, which is merely a different pronunciation. By the same name the Saxons, distinguished the Slavonians in Lusatia. Even in Charlemagne's time there were *Moinu-Winidi* and *Ratang-Winidi* along the rivers named in the compound designation; and similarly there were, in classical times, *Vinde-lici*, or "*Wineds* on the Lech," in Bavaria, who are expressly coupled and contrasted with the Raeti, and the march-field explains, in this sense, the name of *Vindo-bonum*, the projecting angle of the German border along the Danube. But unless this stratum of population was continued further south, how shall we account for the *Veneli* at the head of the Adriatic? It seems to me to follow as a necessary consequence, that the Rætians, who gave the name to the *Vindelici* in Bavaria, must also have given this name to their eastern neighbours on the sea-coast; which is the same as saying that there was a continuous stratum of Gothic or Low-German population from the Baltic to the Adriatic. And if we are to accept the ancient tradition, the Rasenic conquerors of Etruria, who were connected with Raetia, belonged *eo nomine* to this Gothic stock.

3. The name *Ῥασένα*, which, Dionysius tells us, is the original and native name of the Etruscans, does not occur in any other author, and various attempts have been made to get rid of it. A favourite device has been to identify this word with *Τυρσηνός*; but Lepsius, who has lent the sanction of his name to a conjecture, as easy as it is unsatisfactory, has sufficiently shewn that the name *Τυρσηνός* is of Pelasgian origin, and that it signifies a builder of *τύρσεις* or towers: and if the Rasenic ingredient was not Pelasgian, we must seek for some other explanation of the name *Rasena*. Now although *Ῥασένα* is a sort of *ἄπαξ λογόμενον*, or word of solitary occurrence, the name *Etruscus*, and the term *Etruria* = *Etrusia*, from which this ethnical adjective is formed, are found everywhere; and I think that no one now-a-days will adopt Müller's view, that *Etruscus* is an expanded, while *Tuscus* is a clipped form of *Τυρσηνός*. It is in accordance with the soundest principles of etymology to infer that *Et-rus-cus* and *Et-ruc-sa* = *Et-rus-ia*

contain two elements in combination, namely, *et* or *het*, and *rus*. The latter is that form of the root *ras* which would naturally appear in a compound; compare *calco* with *inculco*, *silio* with *consul*, &c. Niebuhr has suggested that *Ras-ena* contains this root *ras* with the termination *ena* found in *Pors-ena*, &c. Now in old Norse *at rasa* signifies "to run;" and whether we identify the prefix *Et* or *Het* with the old Norse *Hetia*, "a warrior," or suppose that it is some prepositional or pronominal prefix, we may plainly see that, according to this old Norse analogy, the *Ras-ena*, or *Et-rus-i*, were a warrior tribe, distinguished by their sudden onset and rapid career. It so happens that the Scandinavians, (when migrating for the purpose of conquest, actually called themselves by this name; for Symeon Magister, who wrote A. D. 1140, actually states that the Scandinavians) who descended the Dnieper, the Volga, and the Don, called themselves *Ros*; that is, as he interprets it, "the runners;" and he adds that they were so designated from the rapidity of their motion. That this would be a very suitable name for a dominant tribe of warriors is clear, from the fact that the higher class at Rome had no older name than that of *Celeres*, or "swift horsemen." The word *ross*, "a horse," afterwards corrupted into *horsa*, undoubtedly contains the same root *ras*. That this was the Low-German term, as opposed to *Hengist*, the High-German appellation, is clear from the mythological conjunction *Hengist* and *Horsa* as the representatives of two tribes, one High and the other Low German, who made a combined invasion of Kent. In a secondary application the word *ross* denotes a running stream, of which the horse was a symbol. Everybody understands the myth of *Pegasus*, "the fountain horse," and knows why the *Sileni*, or "gods of running streams," were represented with horses' tails. I have also demonstrated that the river is often designated, in the oldest languages of the Indo-Germanic family, by words used also to signify "height," "hill," or "hill-tower." (*Varron*. p. 171.) Now in *Rætia* we find a great number of names of rivers and hills which contain this very word *Ross*. Thus we have *Ross-bach* and *Ross-bach-berg*, *Ross-kogel*, *Ross-kar* *Ross-berg*, *Ross-kopf*, *Ross-ruck*, *Ross-wand*, and other similar names

in the Tyrol. If any one can resist the effect of this induction, he has not yet learned to reason philologically. But this is not all. Another name peculiar to the dominant *Rasena* is *Tarquin*, the first syllable of which must bear the same relation to the Scandinavian *Tor* or *Thor* that *Ras* does to *Ross*. Now *Tor* is the Scandinavian Jupiter, and the Tyrseno-Pelasgian god of the same order is *Tina* or *Tana* = *Janus*. As, then, the plural form of the name *Tarquinii*, like that of *Athenæ* or *Thebæ* indicates the union of two communities and two worships, is it not reasonable to conclude, from the mythical nuptials of the native *Tana-quil* with the foreign *Tar-quin* or *Tor-quil*, that there was precisely this combination between the old Norse and the Tyrseno-Pelasgian? With regard to the name *Ros* or *Ras-ena*, it is worthy of remark that the name was so thoroughly identified with the Scandinavians in the north of Europe, that even the Slavonians, when defining the semi-Slavonic tribe of the Lithuanians which we call the "Old Prussians," designated them as *P-rusi* = *Po-rusi*, i. e. "adjoining the *Ros*," from their proximity to the Scandinavian tribes; just as they called the *Pomeranians* *Po-morani*, because they dwelt "on the sea" (*po-more*). We may therefore easily understand the continuance of the same distinctive title in Italy, where they were not neighbours, but an aristocracy of conquest.

4. The warlike *Rasena* distinguish themselves from the more polished race, in the midst of which they settled, by many traits of religious or social peculiarity. Neibuhr, whose sagacity was seldom at fault, remarked that there was a singular resemblance between the Scandinavian mythology and that of the ancient Etruscans. Now the Pelasgian worship was as different as possible from the Scandinavian, and therefore this peculiarity alone is a strong evidence in favour of the presence of a foreign element in the population. The most striking proof, however, of this kind is furnished by the Etruscan practice in regard to the gladiatorial combats at funerals. That these gladiatorial shows were of Etruscan origin is universally admitted. The custom of sacrificing prisoners of war at the tomb of a departed warrior is connected with the traditions of the Trojan war. Such a sacrifice

takes place at the funeral of Patroclus ; and Achilles himself is appeased by the immolation of Polyxena. There can be no doubt that the funeral sacrifice of human victims was derived by the Pelasgians from the Phœnicians, in whose religion this inhuman worship of Moloch was one of the most characteristic features. We see in Etruscan monuments a hideous monster waiting for his promised meed of human blood, while the gladiators are fighting round the tomb ; and the substitution of this sort of combat, instead of the cold-blooded slaughter in which the Pelasgo-Phœnician rites revelled, must be attributed to a warlike race like the *Rasena*, who, whether in sport or earnest, delighted in every form of martial spectacle, and whose descendants, in another part of Europe, introduced the chivalrous and sometimes bloody exercise of the tournament.

5. If all these arguments could be set aside, the evidence of linguistic affinity between the scanty remains of the old Etruscan and the old Norse would be sufficient of themselves to settle the question.

The argument from the language depends upon so many details, that an attempt to state it at length would be eminently tedious ; nor is it necessary that I should go into the question at length. The particulars are already in print, and I shall refer you to the book itself, contenting myself with exhibiting to you, on the present occasion, the nature and amount of the evidence which is already before the public.

It is a matter of certainty that the oldest inhabitants of Etruria were Pelasgo-Umbrians, and that the nation owed its art and social culture mainly to the Pelasgo-Tyrsenians, whom the Rasenic conquerors found established in the country. Accordingly, it was to be expected *à priori* that a large and significant proportion of their language would admit of direct comparison with the other dialects of the peninsula. And so it is. The names of most of their deities, and the great majority of their words which have come down to us with an explanation, are easily analyzed by a reference to the common element in Greek and Latin. But there are terms which do not admit of this method of explanation ; and what shall we say when we find that, without a single exception, they yield

at the first touch to the pass-key of the old Norse interpreter. Take the first in the alphabetical list of their words: *æsar*, which in the Etruscan language, as Suetonius tells us, signified *deus*. Is it an accident that *ass* pl. *æsir*, "Deus," is "nomen nusquam non occurrens" in old Icelandic? Then we have the bilingual inscription of Pisaurum, in which *haruspex fulguriator* is rendered in Etruscan by *trutnft phruntac*. Is it a merely accidental coincidence that *tru-teinn-fit*, "brandishing the wand of truth," is a compound of genuine old Norse elements, and that the *Hymis-Caida* speaks thus of divination:

athr suthir yethi

hristo *ternd*

Ok à hlaut sa.

"before they found the *truth* they shook the *wands* of divination and inspected the blood?" So that *trutnft* exactly corresponds to *haruspex*. And is it a merely accidental coincidence that *phrun-tac*, which is rendered *fulguriator*, refers us at once to the Icelandic *fur* or *fyr*, "fire," and to the verb *tak-na*, "ominari," so that *phruntac* or *furn-tak* is "one who takes omens from fire?" When such coincidences explain all the elements of a brace of compound words, the meaning of which we know by monumental evidence, the result is not surprise: it is conviction. Again, if there were no affinity between the Scandinavians and Etruscans, how shall we explain the fact that the Old Norse words *sut*, "dolor, mastitia, luctus," and its synonym, *trege*, occur, not once but constantly, in Etruscan funeral inscriptions, just where we should expect to find them? Next to a contemporaneous interpretation in a bilingual inscription there is no evidence stronger than this; and no one, I think, after it has once been pointed out to him, can fail to see that the inscription *eca ershe nact achrum phler trce*, on an amphora, representing the parting of a man and his wife, must mean "this earthen vessel in the ground is a votive offering of sorrow."

But in linguistic comparisons, grammar is even stronger than lexicography. The longest Etruscan inscription—that at Perugia—begins thus:

*Eu lat tanna la-rezul amev achr lautn Velthinas.*

At first sight *lat tanna* reminds one of the common form in

the Runic inscriptions, in which an infinite in *-a* follows the auxiliary *lit*. This resemblance occurred to me when I was reading the Runic inscriptions, with a totally different object, at the request of my friend, Mr. Carlson, then the Swedish chaplain in London. Of course I was unable at first to prove that *lat* and *tanna*, in the inscription before us, were verbs related as auxiliary and infinitive; but an accident put me in possession of the proof, which I exhibit to you to-night. This *patera* which I hold in my hand was brought from Chiusi by my friend, Mr. Oakes, M.P. for Bury St. Edmund's, a few years ago, and was at once submitted to me. I found an inscription of only three words—*stem tenilaeth Nfatia*—which, as any philologer will agree with me in maintaining, must consist of the nom. case *Nfatia*, the proper name of a woman; a verb *tenilaeth*, signifying “she offers,” i. e. *tendit* (Icelandic *thenia*), “she holds out with the hand,” and an acc. *stem*, obviously a pronoun signifying “this,” i. e. *stem flenim*; for the supplemental *patera*, or companion offering in the same grave is *flenim thekinthl thmtflaneth*, which, in tolerably good Icelandic, means, “Thekenthul giveth a *patera*, or open cup, for the dark dwelling.” The proper name *Thekinthl* has at any rate a thoroughly Scandinavian sound. The name of *Thurtle*, anciently *Thorketl*, in Norfolk, which obtained an unenviable notoriety in the annals of crime, is just such another designation. Almost all the recumbent figures on the Etruscan sarcophagi hold these *pateras* in their hands; and in one, of which I have lately given a lengthened description, and which is engraved in the Transactions of our West-Suffolk Archæological Institute, the wife of the deceased makes this offering to her husband, as she stands by his funeral altar, on the bas-relief which adorns the principal face of the tomb. Now this verb *tenilaeth* is obviously an agglutinate form like those which are constantly found in Gothic; and the co-existence of *lat-tanna* and *teni-laeth* does, in my opinion, settle the question as to the meaning of both. The other words in the beginning of the Perugian inscription are, as I have shewn, also capable of Icelandic interpretation, and I can render them thus: “Here Lartius, the son of Ræsius, let offer a field of mourning as or for the grave of Velthina.”

It is easy to tell me that I cannot render the whole of this long inscription on the same principle. I am prevented from making the attempt by that sense of the real value of these inquiries which always saves sound criticism from the compromise of its own dignity. Under the circumstances of the case, it is not to be expected that a long inscription in Etruscan should be interpreted without some bilingual key to its meaning. But does this affect the question of the discovery to which I lay claim? Does any one doubt that Young, Champollion, and Lepsius, have settled the question respecting the principles on which Egyptian hieroglyphics are to be interpreted, or that the language of those hieroglyphics is akin to the Coptic? And yet a facetious sceptic has declared, that if two Egyptologists agree in their independent interpretation of two consecutive lines in any hieroglyphic inscription, he will undertake to gallop the great sphinx round the great pyramid! At any rate I will venture to say that the most eminent Egyptologist in Europe will not undertake to translate forty-six consecutive lines of the "Book of the Dead," in the Turin Papyrus, which would about correspond in length to the Perugian inscription. But there is another Perugian inscription which I have translated, as far as it is perfect, and I have pointed out that it contains a peculiar form of the Old Norse aorist, which has been made the subject of special commentary. The inscription to which I refer runs thus in the first of the two lines of which it consists:—"Cehen suthi hinthiu thues sains Etve thaure lautnesele caresri Aules Larthia precuthursi," and may be rendered in approximate Low-German—"hier sut henter (or iftir) theoves seins Elfa thaure lautnesele lit kara Aules Larthia frægu thurase," or, in English, "Here Aul. Lartius let engrave sorrow after (*i. e.* in honour of) his uncle Etf us on the sepulchral tomb a prayer for the dead."

I have thus laid before you a brief, but, I believe, a sufficiently distinct outline of the affinities which connect the *Rasena* of the south and the *Ros*, or Scandinavians of the north, the two ends of a chain of cognate tribes, which extended with a fluctuating but still continuous boundary line, indicated by the name *Wend* or *Wened* given to those who lived across the border, from the Baltic to the Adriatic. I know not what evi-

dence in favour of an ethnographic theory could be added to that which I have collected and arranged. If any other tests can be applied, let this be stated, and I will at once inquire whether they are available to this investigation. If not, it seems to me that the solution proposed deserves at least an accurate exposition and an impartial examination. For if it is found, that not only no other view of the case is equally tenable, but that the tendency of all inquiry is in the direction which I have indicated, we may hope that the greatest reproach of philological ethnography, the non-discovery of the Etruscan language, is in a fair way to be removed. In the mean time it is simply absurd to repeat the old saying, that we know nothing about Etruscan, beyond the fact that *afil ril* means *vixit annos*, and that we do not even know which of these words corresponds to *vixit*, and which to *annos*, the fact being, that *avil* or *afil*, which in the bilingual inscription, is rendered *ætatis*, must contain the same root as *æv-um* and *æ-tas* = *ævi-tas*, and that *ril* is good Low-German for the flowing course of a stream, which is the primary meaning of *annus* and *ἀεναός*. I leave it to the Ethnological Society to decide whether we do not know a great deal more than this; whether, in fact, the *prima-facie* evidence for the conclusion at which I have arrived is not so uniform and complete, as to leave my theory in possession of the field, at least until some other method of reconciling and explaining all the phenomena is found to answer the various tests to which I have submitted my own speculations.

In the Perugian inscription there are dots placed between some of the letters, as if to group them into words, which is, indeed, considered to be their use. Now, before removing these dots to other places, it must be shewn that they are erroneously placed. Sir W. Betham removed them to please his fancy, and grouped the letters into Celtic words. Dr. Donaldson has grouped them differently, and formed Scandinavian words.—EDITOR.